

## COMMISSION FOR TEACHER PREPARATION AND LICENSING

1020 O STREET  
SACRAMENTO 95814

(916) 445-0184



9 February 1979

78-7934

TO: Commission-Approved Bilingual Assessor Agencies

FROM: Peter L. LoPresti, Executive Secretary *PL*

SUBJECT: Monitoring of Agencies Approved to Assess and Recommend  
Candidates for the Bilingual Certificate of Competence

This is to inform you that on February 3, 1979 the Commission approved the enclosed plan for the monitoring of agencies approved to assess and recommend candidates for the Bilingual Certificate of Competence. In addition to reviewing the data listed in the plan, the on-site visitation by the monitoring team will focus on the process and procedures being followed in implementing the revised guidelines and scoring criteria adopted by the Commission on September 2, 1978. These guidelines and scoring criteria were distributed to you earlier and are also included in this packet for your information.

Additionally, the monitoring team will be collecting random-selected audio-tapes of interviews conducted by assessor panels to determine language proficiency. The process to be followed in selecting the tapes was detailed to you in my letter of September 6, 1978.

The process to be followed in preparing these tapes for review and selection by the monitoring team is as follows:

1. Prepare two alphabetical lists of those candidates who took the oral proficiency examination for the first time between October 1, 1978 and February 16, 1979. One list will identify those who passed the examination, the other will identify those who failed the examination.
2. For each list, start with the first candidate and mark every 10th candidate.

Tapes of interviews selected by this process will be collected and retained by the monitoring team for further study. In accordance with the law, the personal identities of the candidates will not be further disclosed in individually identifiable form.

In addition to the monitoring plan I am also including a copy of the calendar showing when assessor agencies are to be monitored. Should you need further information please feel free to contact Gustavo Getner at (916) 445-6772.

Enclosures

CALENDAR FOR MONITORING OF AGENCIES  
ASSESSING AND RECOMMENDING CANDIDATES  
FOR THE BILINGUAL CERTIFICATE OF COMPETENCE

WEEK OF FEBRUARY 19-23, 1979

Pomona Unified School District  
Orange County Department of Education  
San Bernardino Unified School District

WEEK OF FEBRUARY 26-28, 1979

Oakland Unified School District  
Berkeley Unified School District  
Butte County Department of Education

WEEK OF MARCH 5-9, 1979

Merced County Department of Education  
Fresno County Department of Education  
Tulare County Department of Education

WEEK OF MARCH 12-16, 1979

San Jose Unified School District  
San Francisco Unified School District  
San Mateo County Department of Education

WEEK OF MARCH 19-23, 1979

Monterey County Department of Education  
Kern County Department of Education  
San Diego County Department of Education

WEEK OF MARCH 26-30, 1979

Los Angeles County Department of Education  
Santa Barbara County Department of Education  
Ventura County Department of Education

WEEK OF APRIL 9-13, 1979

Cal Poly, Pomona  
CSU Fullerton  
University of LaVerne

WEEK OF APRIL 16-20, 1979

University of Southern California  
CSU Dominguez Hills  
San Diego State University

## COMMISSION FOR TEACHER PREPARATION AND LICENSING

1020 O STREET  
SACRAMENTO 95814

15 January 1979

TO: Members of the Licensing Committee  
FROM: Eli Obradovich, <sup>EO</sup>Chief, Licensing  
BY: Gustavo Getner, Coordinator, Bilingual Teacher Preparation Programs  
SUBJECT: Monitoring of Assessor Agencies Assessing and Recommending for the Bilingual Certificate of Competence

Background

Under the Bilingual Statutes of 1976 (AB 3339) the Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing was authorized to grant certificates of bilingual crosscultural competence. As a result of this mandate the Commission adopted guidelines for the implementation of these statutes in May 1977. Said guidelines provided for LEAs under a specified set of requirements and IHEs with approved bilingual crosscultural programs to assess and recommend for the Bilingual Certificate of Competence.

In the Fall of 1977 the Commission authorized staff to commence monitoring of LEAs and IHEs assessing and recommending candidates for the certificate. This task was initiated in September, 1977 with the monitoring of LEAs and terminated in May, 1978 with the monitoring of IHEs. Reports on the findings were presented to the Commission at the completion of the monitoring task.

As a result of recommendations made at a bilingual workshop sponsored by the Commission on June 5-6, 1978, and mandated by Legislation (AB 3463), the guidelines regulating the assessment and recommendation of candidates for the Bilingual Certificate of Competence were extended by the Commission to include IHEs wishing to assess candidates for the Certificate. Said guidelines required that IHEs submit programs for approval to the Commission for any assessments conducted after October 1, 1978.

On August 9-10, 1978 a committee of LEA and IHE representatives were convened to review and revise the assessment plan requirements leading to the certificate, to revise the language and culture competencies, and to develop scoring criteria to be followed by assessor agencies in assessing candidates for the certificate. These revisions were accepted and approved by the Commission in September, 1978.

Monitoring Plan

The objective of monitoring efforts for the 1978-79 academic year will be:

1. To verify that assessor agencies approved by the Commission to assess and recommend teachers for the Bilingual Certificate of Competence are implementing their plan as approved by the Commission;

2. To determine the effectiveness of existing standards, criteria, and assessment procedures, in assuring that teachers recommended for the Bilingual Certificate of Competence meet required levels of skills and knowledge for authorization to teach in bilingual classrooms of the public schools of California.

#### Performance Requirements

1. The monitoring process must provide for the monitoring of all assessor agencies by May 1, 1979.
2. Data upon which the monitoring activities are to be based are:
  - a. The formal plans submitted by the assessor agencies for conducting the assessment of certificated teachers.
  - b. The language and culture competencies and the scoring criteria adopted by the Commission.
3. The system must provide the Commission with data for decisions regarding the desirability of revising assessment procedures, scoring criteria, and standards in language, culture, and methodology.
4. The system must provide data to the Commission concerning the effectiveness of the revised guidelines leading to the certificate.

#### Overview of Monitoring Process

The on-site monitoring process will be conducted by Commission staff and an individual external to the Commission and the agency being monitored. These external assessors will consist of IHE personnel who will assess LEAs and LEA personnel who will assess IHEs. All external assessors will be bilingual, bicultural and familiar with bilingual teaching methodology. Typically, one Commission staff representative will team with one external assessor to conduct the monitoring visitation during the course of one - two calendar days.

The on-site visitation will include the following:

1. A review of all instruments used in the assessment of candidates to determine knowledge of language and culture. A review of how Assessment Plan Requirement guidelines 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11 (page 2, Appendix A) have been implemented.
2. An examination of the selection process utilized in selecting panel members involved in assessing the oral language proficiency of candidates.
3. Listening to audio-tapes of panel interviews; audio-tapes to be randomly selected.
4. A review of all resumes of panel members involved in assessing the oral language proficiency of all candidates.

5. A review of the process followed in implementing the scoring criteria approved by the Commission to measure knowledge of the language and culture competencies (pages 4 - 11, Appendix A).
6. A review of the record-keeping system utilized by the agency.
7. Collection of tapes for study of oral language proficiency interview process.
8. An exit interview with assessor agency to discuss the findings of the on-site visitation.

#### Time Schedule

The following time schedule will be followed in implementing the monitoring plan:

1. Training of external assessors will be conducted on February 15, 1979.
2. On-site visitations to start on February 22, 1979.
3. Monitoring to be completed by May 1, 1979.
4. Report on monitoring will be presented on June 1, 1979.

#### Staff Recommendation

It is the recommendation of staff that the monitoring plan be approved as presented and that agencies assessing and recommending candidates for the Bilingual Certificate of Competence be notified of the process to be followed.

## APPENDIX A

### COMMISSION FOR TEACHER PREPARATION AND LICENSING

#### REVISED GUIDELINES FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CERTIFICATE OF COMPETENCE AND ASSESSMENT AS MANDATED IN CHAPTER 984 OF THE STATUTES OF 1976

September 20, 1978

##### A. Certificate of Competence

A certificate of competence will be issued to an applicant who submits an application and a fee of \$20 and is recommended by an approved assessor agency which certifies that the applicant has met all the following requirements:

1. Possession of a valid California teaching credential based upon a baccalaureate degree and student teaching.
2. Verification of ability to read, write and communicate orally in the target language through an approved assessment process.
3. Verification of knowledge of the culture of the target population through an approved assessment process.
4. Verification of the ability to teach the basic teaching authorization in English and a language other than English.

##### B. Approved Assessor Agency

The Commission will review assessment plans submitted by assessor agencies and will reserve the right to approve; to not approve; or to solicit additional information or clarification relating to those plans. The Commission will also reserve the right to monitor the implementation of those plans and to withdraw approval whenever evidence indicates that the plan is not being implemented as proposed. Initial approval of assessment plans shall expire on June 30, 1979.

An approved assessor agency is a college or university with a Commission-approved program for bilingual teacher training; a school district with an established state or federal bilingual education program and at least 30,000 average daily attendance (ADA); or a county superintendent of schools who has full-time bilingual professional personnel responsible for servicing specific bilingual education programs.

Districts and county offices not eligible to act as assessment agents may petition the Commission on the basis of hardship describing an assessment procedure which may or may not be involved with collaboration with other districts or institutions of higher education. That petition must be consistent with Commission guidelines.

### C. Assessment Plan Requirements

Each assessment plan submitted to the Commission by a potential assessor agency shall include but not be limited to all of the following components:

1. A description of both the assessment process(es) and any instruments used in the process including passing standards.
2. Documentation of how the processes, instruments, and standards assess the language, culture, and methodological competencies established by the Commission.
3. Provision for supplying each unsuccessful candidate with a diagnostic report which will identify clearly areas of weakness or deficiency.
4. A description of the length of time proposed for each individual assessment and the frequency of administration proposed.
5. Provisions for supplying the Commission with information about both successful and unsuccessful candidates after each assessment period.
6. A description of the process for informing candidates of the procedure for appeal.
7. A statement of the maximum charge to any candidate for any one language and culture assessment and the rationale for this charge.
8. A description of provisions for assessing candidates who are not employed by the assessor agency.
9. A description of alternate instruments used in re-assessing unsuccessful candidates.
10. A description of scoring criteria used in assessing competencies other than language and culture.
11. Panel Interview Requirements and Options:

#### A. Panel Assessment Options

In order to provide flexibility and to be responsive to the varying capabilities and needs of all agencies and teachers, agencies may use either one of the following options in establishing the panels used to determine oral language proficiency. Assessment records kept by agencies shall indicate which panel was used in the assessment of each candidate.

1. Option one:

The examining panel shall consist of two regularly credentialed classroom teachers (K 12) who are bilingual/biliterate and who have had experience in public school bilingual education, preferably holding a regular bilingual/cross-cultural credential; one bilingual/biliterate person from the lay target community; two bilingual/biliterate faculty members who are currently teaching in ethnic study classes in the target culture, or in language classes in the target language, or in bilingual education classes at institutes of higher education and who are not regularly employed by the school district or county superintendent for which the assessment is being conducted.

Successful passage of this assessment will be determined by a majority of the ratings of the panel members based on criteria established by the Commission.

2. Option two:

The examining panel shall consist of one bilingual/biliterate credentialed classroom teacher; one full-time higher education faculty who is bilingual/biliterate/bicultural; and one community lay person who is bilingual/bicultural. Successful passage of this assessment will be determined by unanimous vote of the panel based on the criteria established by the Commission.

B. Training of Panel Members

1. All panel members assessing language proficiency shall be trained in interview techniques and procedures prior to the assessing of candidates.
2. Agencies shall maintain in their records a description of the selection criteria and process used in establishing each and every interview panel.

C. Guidelines for conducting interviews

The following guidelines are to be followed during the interviewing of candidates by panels assessing for language proficiency.

1. All panel interviews will be a minimum of 15 minutes.
2. All panel interviews will be conducted in the target language.
3. An agency using the panel to determine other than language proficiency (i.e. knowledge of culture and methodology) shall include in their original plan or as an addendum to the original plan a description of the areas to be assessed and the scoring criteria that will be used.



In addition to the above, panels shall interview candidates in English for five minutes to determine English proficiency. This shall be for the purpose of providing the Commission with information on the English language proficiency of candidates and not for the purpose of recommending or denying the Certificate of Competence.

The interview portion of the assessment shall be audio-taped and all tape records shall be kept intact unless release is authorized by the Commission.

The Programs Committee and the Commission has approved the following:

A body external to the Commission and the LEAs should review audio-tapes to determine reliability of scoring. This review will be for the purpose of gathering information on the assessment process and will be financed by the Commission.

D. Appeal Provisions

The assessor agency shall inform unsuccessful candidates of their right to appeal to the Commission and shall make available to the Commission the audio-tape record of the original interview and written portions of the assessment and the diagnostic report identifying areas of weakness in the language and culture competencies.

- E. The following 1-5 scoring criteria (or equivalent percentages) shall be followed by all agencies in assessing each of the language and culture competencies. Criterion number three is considered the minimum score for successfully passing each competency.

The development of these scoring criteria was recommended by IHE and LEA delegates to a Commission-sponsored Bilingual Education Workshop held on June 5-6, 1978. As a result of this recommendation, a committee of LEA and IHE representatives was convened on August 9-10, 1978, to develop scoring criteria for each of the language and culture competencies being assessed. The criteria established by this committee, shown below, was approved and adapted by the Commission on September 2, 1978.

Culture Curriculum Competencies

The teacher shall have knowledge of:

- A. THE LIFE STYLE OF THE TARGET POPULATION

Scoring Criteria

1. The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge of terms.

2. The candidate demonstrates basic knowledge of terms with some application.
3. The candidate expands on the differences and similarities between the life style of the target population and American society; e.g. family and community structures, values.
4. The candidate demonstrates advanced knowledge of the life style of the target population; e.g. identifies music, art, literature.
5. The candidate demonstrates superior knowledge of the life style of the target population; e.g. can cite and apply research findings.

B. THE HISTORICAL ROLE AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE TARGET POPULATION TO AMERICAN SOCIETY.

Scoring Criteria

1. The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge of the historical role and contributions of the target population to American society.
2. The candidate demonstrates basic knowledge of the historical role and contributions of the target population to American society.
3. The candidate expands on his/her knowledge of the historical role and contributions of the target population to American society; e.g. findings, personalities, specific contributions.
4. The candidate demonstrates advanced knowledge of the historical role and contributions of the target population to American society; e.g. identifies social, political, and economic developments.
5. The candidate demonstrates superior knowledge of the historical role and contributions of the target population; e.g. cites and applies findings of research.

C. THE SOCIAL CLASS STRUCTURE WITHIN THE COMMUNITIES OF THE TARGET POPULATION.

Scoring Criteria

1. The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge of the social class structure within the communities of the target population.

2. The candidate demonstrates basic knowledge of the social class structure within the communities of the target population.
3. The candidate expands on his/her knowledge of the social class structure within the communities of the target population; e.g. social, religious values of family and community groups.
4. The candidate demonstrates advanced knowledge of the social class structure within the communities of the target population; e.g. identifies dynamics of changes in society.
5. The candidate demonstrates superior knowledge of the social class structure within the communities of the target population; e.g. cites and applies research findings.

D. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEARNING AND THE CULTURAL BACKGROUND OF THE TARGET POPULATION.

Scoring Criteria

1. The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge of the relationship between learning and the cultural background of the target population.
2. The candidate demonstrates basic knowledge of the relationship between learning and the cultural background of the target population.
3. The candidate demonstrates ability to expand on his/her knowledge of the relationship between learning and the cultural background of the target population; e.g. identifies influences such as family, religion, peer groups.
4. The candidate demonstrates advanced knowledge of the relationship between learning and the cultural background of the target population; e.g. adapts instructional strategies to cultural background.
5. The candidate demonstrates superior knowledge of the relationship between learning and the cultural background of the target population; e.g. cites and applies research findings.

E. COMMUNITY GROUPS, INSTITUTIONS, SOCIAL AND POLITICAL STRUCTURES WITHIN THE COMMUNITY OF THE TARGET POPULATION.

Scoring Criteria

1. The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge of community groups, institutions, and social and political structures within the community of the target population.

2. The candidate demonstrates basic knowledge of community groups, institutions, and social and political structures within the community of the target population.
3. The candidate expands on his/her knowledge of community groups, institutions, and social and political structures within the community of the target population; e.g. identifies roles and functions.
4. The candidate demonstrates advanced knowledge of community groups, institutions, and social and political structures within the community of the target population; e.g. institutions and groups as change agents.
5. The candidate demonstrates superior knowledge of community groups, institutions, and social and political structures within the community of the target population; e.g. cites and applies research findings.

F. THE DYNAMICS OF CULTURE CONFLICT EXPERIENCED BY THE COMMUNITY OF THE TARGET POPULATION.

Scoring Criteria

1. The candidate demonstrates limited knowledge of the dynamics of culture conflict experienced by the community of the target population.
2. The candidate demonstrates basic knowledge of the dynamics of culture conflict experienced by the community of the target population.
3. The candidate expands on his knowledge of the dynamics of culture conflict experienced by the community of the target population; e.g. familiarity with factors, conditions, cause and effect.
4. The candidate demonstrates advanced knowledge of the dynamics of culture conflict experienced by the community of the target population; e.g. identifies causes of alienation, estrangement, solutions.
5. The candidate demonstrates superior knowledge of the dynamics of culture conflict experienced by the community of the target population; e.g. cites and applies research findings.

Language Curriculum Competencies

The teacher shall have the following abilities in English and the target language:

A. UNDERSTANDING OF THE LANGUAGE AS USED IN PERSONAL COMMUNICATION AND IN THE PUBLIC MEDIA.

Scoring Criteria

1. The candidate demonstrates limited understanding of the language as used in personal communication and in the public media.
2. The candidate demonstrates minimal understanding of the language as used in personal communication and in the public media.
3. The candidate demonstrates functional use of the language as used in personal communication and in the public media; e.g. understands all that is said, understands radio and TV broadcasts.
4. The candidate demonstrates advanced knowledge of the language as used in personal communication and in the public media; e.g. understands educational and colloquial speech.
5. The candidate demonstrates native ability in understanding the language as used in personal communication and in the public media.

B. ABILITY TO USE THE LANGUAGE IN SPONTANEOUS CONVERSATION IN A VARIETY OF SITUATIONS.

Scoring Criteria

1. The candidate demonstrates limited ability to use the language in spontaneous conversation in a variety of situations; e.g. uses only set expressions.
2. The candidate demonstrates minimal ability to use the language in spontaneous conversation in a variety of situations; e.g. conversing in a limited social context.
3. The candidate demonstrates functional ability to use the language in spontaneous conversation in a variety of situations; e.g. relatively few or minor grammatical errors, has command of vocabulary.
4. The candidate demonstrates advanced ability to use the language in spontaneous conversation in a variety of situations; e.g. uses language fluently and accurately at all levels.
5. The candidate demonstrates native ability to use the language in spontaneous conversation in a variety of situations; e.g. equal to educated native speakers.

C. ABILITY TO READ AND COMPREHEND TEXTS APPROPRIATE TO THE AUTHORIZATION.

Scoring Criteria

1. Candidate demonstrates limited ability to read and comprehend texts appropriate to the authorization.
2. Candidate demonstrates minimal ability to read and comprehend texts appropriate to the authorization.
3. The candidate demonstrates functional ability to read and comprehend texts appropriate to the authorization.
4. The candidate demonstrates advanced ability to read and comprehend texts appropriate to the authorization; e.g. reads and understands technical educational material.
5. The candidate demonstrates native ability to read and comprehend texts appropriate to the authorization; e.g. reads, understands, interprets all printed material at the level of an educated native speaker.

D. ABILITY TO WRITE EFFECTIVELY IN A VARIETY OF CONTEXTS.

Scoring Criteria

1. The candidate demonstrates limited ability to write effectively in a variety of contexts.
2. The candidate demonstrates minimal ability to write effectively in a variety of contexts.
3. The candidate demonstrates functional ability to write effectively in a variety of contexts; e.g. minimum of spelling and grammatical errors.
4. The candidate demonstrates advanced ability to write effectively in a variety of contexts; e.g. writes educational and technical material appropriate to the authorization.
5. The candidate demonstrates native ability to write effectively in a variety of contexts; e.g. writes technical and educational material at level of educated native speaker.

E. ABILITY TO TEACH THE BASIC TEACHING AUTHORIZATION IN BOTH LANGUAGES.

Scoring Criteria

1. The candidate demonstrates limited ability to teach the basic teaching authorization in both languages.

2. The candidate demonstrates minimal ability to teach the basic teaching authorization in both languages.
3. The candidate demonstrates functional ability to teach the basic teaching authorization in both languages; e.g. knows basics of bilingual teaching methodology.
4. The candidate demonstrates advanced ability to teach the basic authorization in both languages; e.g. can describe and apply an acceptable bilingual educational model.
5. The candidate demonstrates superior ability to teach the basic authorization in both languages; e.g. exceptional knowledge of bilingual teaching strategies and resources.

F. A GENERAL KNOWLEDGE OF SECOND LANGUAGE LEARNING PATTERNS.

Scoring Criteria

1. The candidate demonstrates a limited knowledge of second language learning patterns.
2. The candidate demonstrates minimal knowledge of second language learning patterns.
3. The candidate demonstrates functional knowledge of second language learning patterns; e.g. knows acquisition of four basic language skills (listening, reading, speaking, writing) and their components.
4. The candidate demonstrates advanced knowledge of second language learning skills; e.g. can apply to instructional program.
5. The candidate demonstrates superior knowledge of second language learning patterns; e.g. can cite and apply research findings.

G. AN APPRECIATION OF THE DISTINCTIVE SPEAKING STYLES OF PUPILS AND THE ABILITY TO GUIDE THEM IN THE USE OF STANDARD LANGUAGE.

Scoring Criteria

1. The candidate demonstrates limited awareness of the distinctive speaking styles of pupils and limited ability to guide them in the use of standard language.
2. The candidate demonstrates minimal awareness of the distinctive speaking style of pupils and minimal ability to guide them in the use of standard language.
3. The candidate can describe distinctive speaking styles and is able to utilize in an instructional program.

4. The candidate can describe phonological and linguistic differences and interferences found in speaking styles.
5. The candidate can cite and apply research findings.

H. SENSITIVITY TO THE DISTINCTIVE STYLES OF NON-VERBAL COMMUNICATION THAT PUPILS BRING TO THE CLASSROOM.

Scoring Criteria

1. The candidate demonstrates limited sensitivity to the distinctive style of non-verbal communication that the pupils bring to the classroom.
2. The candidate demonstrates minimal sensitivity to the distinctive style of non-verbal communication that the pupils bring to the classroom.
3. The candidate demonstrates functional knowledge of the distinctive style of non-verbal communication that the pupils bring to the classroom; e.g. hand gestures, body movement, eye contact.
4. The candidate can adopt non-verbal communication techniques to classroom use.
5. The candidate can cite and apply research findings related to non-verbal communication.



Keley Unified School District  
8 Shattuck Avenue  
Keley, CA 94704

San Jose Unified Sch. Dist.  
1605 Park Avenue  
San Jose, CA 95126

Maria Ramos  
San Mateo County Supt. of Schools  
4000 Main Street  
San Jose, CA 95121

Ms. Mary Jew  
San Mateo County Supt. of Sch  
333 Main Street  
Redwood, City, CA 94063

Clark Acosta  
Imperial Education  
Angeles County Dept. of Ed.  
100 East Imperial Highway  
Imperial, CA 90242

Ms. Susan T. Flores, Director  
Santa Barbara County Supt. of  
Schools Office  
4400 Cathedral Oaks Rd  
Santa Barbara, CA 93111

Frank J. Morales  
San Diego County Supt. of Schools  
West 13th Street  
San Diego, CA 95340

Dr. Roberto Aguilar  
Tulare County Supt. of Schools  
Education Bldg - County Civic Center  
Visalia, CA 93277

Alice Michael, Coordinator  
Ventura County Supt. of Sch  
P.O. Box 851-901 Blanco Circle  
Ventura, CA 93901

Mr. Cliff Rodrigues  
Ventura County Supt. of Schools  
535 East Main Street  
Ventura, CA 93001

Joseph P. Rice, Assoc. Director  
921st Street  
Room 203  
Pomona, CA 95812

Dr. Rafael Estupinian  
Pomona Unified School District  
800 South Garey Avenue  
P.O. Box 2900  
Pomona, CA 91766

Joseph A. Lucero  
Orange County Supt. of Schools  
100 South Grand Ave. Bldg B  
Santa Ana, CA 92711

Dr. Merland F. Despain  
Director  
Kern County Supt. of Schools  
5801 Sundale Avenue  
Bakersfield, CA 93309

Frank Ayala, Director  
Bernardino City Unif. Schl  
100 "F" Street  
Bernardino, CA 92410

Rosalia Salinas  
San Diego County Supt. of Schl  
100 Linda Vista Rd  
San Diego, CA 92111

Raymond del Portillo  
San Francisco Unif. Sch. Dist.  
100 Van Ness Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94102

*Pomona Dr. Leo Lopez Sch. of Ed.  
Fresno Dr. David Lopez, Title 7 Supt.  
Lodi Dr. Jim Coleman  
ASC Red Reddy Suarez  
J Hill Dr. Max Contreras  
SD State Dr. Alberto Ochoa*